

-13-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on August 31, 2006, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-37 are pending in this Application. Claim 1, 13, 25 and 29 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. Claims 36 and 37 have been added. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested. A version of the claims containing markings to show the changes made is included hereinabove. Applicant believes that the claim as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Preliminary Matters

The Examiner stated that the documents containing definitions of the word property were not received. Applicants confirm that the documents containing definitions of the word property were sent and have enclosed another copy of them herein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,951,652 to Ingrassia Jr, et al. (hereinafter Ingrassia) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171 to Pacifici et al. (hereinafter Pacifici) and U.S. Patent No. 5,774,670 to Montulli.

The Examiner stated that Ingrassia teaches setting a document property of each document contained in a browser to a common value in response to detecting the intent to initiate a collaboration session. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. Ingrassia teaches a Session Id which is synchronized and which is input into a document. Merely placing text into a text box of a document does not qualify as setting a document property of a document. Pacifici and Montulli also fail to disclose or suggest "setting a document property of each document contained in the browser to a common value". The Examiner is taking an unreasonable interpretation of "property" to include any piece of text in a document. Enclosed herewith are definitions of the word

-14-

property from MSN Encarta and the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language which define the term "property" as a "characteristic quality, trait or distinctive feature of something". Clearly then, plain text entered into a text box of a document does not, and should not, qualify as a "property" of the document." Accordingly, none of the prior art discloses or suggests the setting of a document property of each document in a browser to a common value. As further discussed with the Examiner, claims 1, 13, 25 and 29 have been further amended to recite that the document property is a document domain property. The Examiner stated that Montulli teaches setting a domain name in a cookie. Montulli recites, at column 7, line 66 through column 8, line 4 that the state information is stored in the form of a cookie list, and wherein the syntax for the **data** includes a domain name. A domain name value listed within a cookie again does not qualify as a **document domain property** as recites by claim 1. As recited by the Examiner's own reference, the domain property of a document sets or retrieves the security domain of the document. Further, a cookie does not qualify as "each document in the browser" as recited by claim 1. None of the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests setting a document domain property of each document in the browser to a common value, as part of a collaboration session. Claims 13, 25 and 29 contain similar elements as claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-19, 21, 22, 26, 28 and 30-35 depend from claim 1, 13, 25 or 29 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable.

Claims 36-37 have been added. Support for these claims can be found in the specification as filed at page 2, line 28 through page 3, line 3. None of the prior art of record discloses or suggests wherein the state information includes time sensitive information related to a web page on display within a browser, and participant supplied information used in said collaboration session. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the additional claims.

In view of all the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome paving the claims in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

-15-

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-2909

Dated: November 28, 2006